

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES L. STEVENSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
M. JONES,
Defendant.

Case No. [15-cv-05241-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING SECOND REQUEST
TO ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 46

On May 30, 2017, the court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment and entered judgment against plaintiff. Plaintiff then filed a motion to alter or amend the judgment, and the court denied the motion. Next, plaintiff filed a motion to amend his opposition to the already-granted motion for summary judgment; the court denied that motion from plaintiff also.

Plaintiff now returns with a "motion to amend defendants summary of judgment/request for counsel," which the court construes to be another motion to alter or amend the judgment. Docket No. 46. Plaintiff's motion is DENIED because he fails to show that the court committed manifest error of law or fact, does not present new evidence; does not show that the summary judgment decision was manifestly unjust; and does not show an intervening change in controlling law. Insofar as plaintiff is requesting the appointment of counsel in this closed case, that request also is denied. Plaintiff should not file any more motions attacking the judgment on the same grounds he already has presented unsuccessfully.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 25, 2017


SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge